

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

HAROLD EDWIN KING,

Case No. 16-CV-0575 (WMW/FLN)

Plaintiff,

v.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

AMERICAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITY
SYSTEM,

Defendant.

Plaintiff Harold Edwin King did not pay the required filing fee for this case, but instead applied for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”). *See* ECF No. 2. In an order dated April 28, 2016, this Court noted several problems with King’s complaint and declined to grant the IFP application on that basis. *See* ECF No. 3 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)). King was given until May 31, 2016 to submit an amended complaint, failing which it would be recommended that this action be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

That deadline has now passed, and King has not submitted an amended complaint. In fact, King has not communicated with the Court about this case at all since commencing this action. Accordingly, this Court now recommends, in accordance with its prior order, that this action be dismissed without prejudice under Rule 41(b) for failure to prosecute. *See Henderson v. Renaissance Grand Hotel*, 267 Fed. App’x 496, 497 (8th Cir. 2008) (per curiam) (“A district court has discretion to dismiss an action under Rule 41(b) for a plaintiff’s failure to prosecute, or to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or any court order.”).

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing, and on all of the files, records, and proceedings herein, IT IS
HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE under
Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) for failure to prosecute.

Dated: June 3, 2016

s/Franklin L. Noel
Franklin L. Noel
United States Magistrate Judge

NOTICE

Filing Objections: This Report and Recommendation is not an order or judgment of the District Court and is therefore not appealable directly to the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Under Local Rule 72.2(b)(1), “a party may file and serve specific written objections to a magistrate judge’s proposed finding and recommendations within 14 days after being served a copy” of the Report and Recommendation. A party may respond to those objections within 14 days after being served a copy of the objections. LR 72.2(b)(2). All objections and responses must comply with the word or line limits set forth in LR 72.2(c).

Under Advisement Date: This Report and Recommendation will be considered under advisement 14 days from the date of its filing. If timely objections are filed, this Report and Recommendation will be considered under advisement from the earlier of: (1) 14 days after the objections are filed; or (2) from the date a timely response is filed.